

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 10 and 17 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,393,115 to Krauss et al. (hereinafter "Krauss"). The Examiner also rejected claims 2-7, 11-15 and 18-20 as being obvious over Krauss in view of US Patent No. 4,009,347 to Flemming et al.

As indicated and shown above, claims 1-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 21 to 40 are presented for consideration.

Claim 21 recites an apparatus for dialing a communication terminal. The apparatus comprises a memory storing a number of directory entries associated with a number of respective communication terminals. The apparatus comprises an input for entering a string of alphanumeric digits, a comparator for comparing the string to the directory entries, as each digit is entered, and a display for displaying directory entries matching the entered digits. The apparatus further includes a component for selecting one of the matched directory entries and a dialer for dialing the communication terminal associated with the selected directory entry.

It is respectfully submitted that Krauss fails to disclose or suggest the features as recited in Independent claim 21.

In contrast to the present invention, Krauss concerns a CTI system (Title, Abstract). CTI systems are integrated communication terminal (i.e., telephone) / computer solutions that are designed for customer service people who spend much time making phone calls. In a CTI system, as described by Krauss, a PC is typically coupled to the communication terminal. The PC services all of the search/dialing functions of the communication terminal through either an expansion card placed in

the user's PC or a network connection (Column 5, ll. 11-19). Specifically, Krauss teaches a system where a user marks a character string by highlighting and selecting either text or a phone number on the screen of the user's PC when the user encounters the text in an application such as MS Word or Outlook. In response to the text being marked and selected by the user, the CTI system performs the corresponding directory lookup on the phone number or name and allows the user to dial the resulting phone number. (Column 6, ll. 47-59). As such, Kraus fails to teach or suggest an apparatus for comparing, as each digit is entered, a string of alphanumeric digits to a plurality of directory entries for a plurality of communication terminals (third clause of claim 21) and displaying one more matching directory entries as each digit is entered (fourth clause of claim 21). The system disclosed by Krauss, in the minimum, requires completely different steps for a user to mark and select the text to be searched and sent to the directory service. It is, in part, the shortcomings of systems such as those disclosed by Krauss that the present invention seeks to address.

In view of these differences, it is submitted that claim 21 is not anticipated because Krauss does not disclose or suggest each and every feature as recited in independent claim 21. Since claims 22-29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 21, it is further submitted that even if one skilled in the art were to modify or combine the teachings of Krauss with Flemming, the resulting arrangement would not be the same as defined by claims 21-29 and therefore these claims are also not obvious. Similarly, independent system claims 37-40 are not anticipated or obvious in view of the cited references.


Independent claim method claim 30 recites, in part, that the steps of comparing an alphanumeric string and displaying one or matching entries from a plurality of stored directory entries occur as each digit is entered. This is not the same as the system taught by Krauss. For the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 21, it is submitted that independent claim 30 is not anticipated because Krauss does not disclose or teach each and every feature as defined by the claim 30. Since claims 31-36 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 30, it is

submitted that even if one skilled in the art were to modify or combine the teachings of Krauss with Flemming, the resulting arrangement would not be the same as defined by claims 30-36. Therefore, these claims are also not obvious.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn. Favourable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to this submission, please contact William B. Vass at (416) 868-1482.

Respectfully Submitted,
Nortel Networks Limited

By:



William B. Vass, Regn. No. 36,416

Place: Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Date: May 24, 2005